

MEMORANDUM



Faegre Baker Daniels LLP

600 East 96th Street ▼ Suite 600

Indianapolis ▼ Indiana 46240-3789

Phone +1 317 569 9600 Fax +317 569 4800

FaegreBD.com

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

TO: Sarah Reed

FROM: Jesse M. Pohlman

DATE: August 31, 2012

RE: Springmill Corner (1209-PUD-11) – Neighbors' Meeting Report

August 30, 2012 Neighbors' Meeting (began at 7:00 p.m.; ended roughly 8:45 p.m.).

Meeting Location: Village Park Methodist Church (219 West 161st Street).

Approximately forty (40) neighbors attended in addition to the development team (Michael House and Phil French with Cooperstown Partners, LLC, Murray Clark and Jesse Pohlman with Faegre Baker Daniels, LLP, and Matt Brown with A&F Engineering, Inc.), three (3) Council members (Councilors John Dippel, Robert Stokes and Cindy Spoljaric) and Sarah Reed with the Economic and Community Development Department.

As host, Pastor John Parker with Village Park Methodist Church welcomed everyone. Murray Clark introduced the development team and proposed development details and opened up the meeting to questions and comments. The comments received throughout the meeting are generally described below.

The meeting was held as an open forum with a challenge to those in attendance to provide comments and input that could be considered by the development team that would shape and form the proposed development in a way that sets a precedence for the intersection and that neighbors supported that would incorporate the development into the fabric of the neighborhood.

Questions and Comments:

1. Is the site going to be user [**pedestrian**] **friendly** (e.g., sidewalks, multi-use paths, delineated walkways internal to the site, crosswalks across 161st Street, and stop signs internal to the site)? Doesn't believe the Kroger site is very pedestrian friendly. [Response explained there will be perimeter paths as required by the City along 161st Street and Springmill Road and that there will be crosswalks and stop signs internal to the site that will be determined at the time of the development plan. It was explained crosswalks across 161st Street will be part of the City's design if and when the intersection and 161st Street or Springmill Road are improved.]
2. What is the required **parking**? [Response explained parking will comply with the City's Zoning Ordinance as defaulted to by the PUD Ordinance. Examples of the required ratios from the City's Zoning Ordinance were shared.]
3. General concern about the **traffic** situation. [Response explained the traffic impact analysis shows the proposed access points and recommended improvements function appropriately. Those improvements were detailed. It was further explained that 161st Street and its character will drastically change as a result of the US31/161st Street interchange as well as the study currently being undertaken by the City with regard to the various intersections along Springmill Road. It was further explained the City's Thoroughfare Plan plans for improvements to these thoroughfares and those improvements are funded by developments through road impact fees, as development occurs.]
4. General concern about **noise**. Is there a way you can restrict the time and frequency of trash and delivery servicing. Currently the Kroger center receives several trash pick-ups a day. [Response explained that it was possible to incorporate these types of restrictions into the PUD Ordinance.]
5. What **signage** is proposed for the Walgreen's (specifically, will any signage face Mulberry Farms)? [Response explained the signage will default to the City's Zoning Ordinance; however, it was shared the development team would look into this further.]
6. What **lighting** is proposed (concern lighting would spill over)? [Response explained that lights will default to the City's Zoning Ordinance; however, it was shared the development team will look into this further to ensure lights are shielded to direct light downward.]
7. What is the **building height** of the Walgreen's? [Response shared that as proposed, it is one-story at twenty-seven feet tall.]
8. General questions about the **process** and timing of construction if approved.
9. What are the **hours of operation**? [Response explained that Walgreen's generally opens up in neighborhoods with hours of 8 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.; however, if the neighborhoods dictate other hours, then Walgreen's adjusts it hours accordingly, so ultimately it is determined by those neighborhoods it serves.]

10. **Why not develop** a Walgreen's **elsewhere** (e.g., at SR32 or at another location)? [Response explained that Walgreen's is a neighborhood-oriented business which serves a small market radius that could be as small as two-miles. In this case, this site is ideally situated along two major thoroughfares and within close proximity to existing households. The other locations do not currently support a Walgreens, though in the future if they do; it is possible an additional Walgreen's to be built to serve those future neighborhoods.]
11. What are the proposed **uses** and is there a way to restrict those uses? [Response explained those uses that are initially being contemplated and that the PUD Ordinance currently defaults to the City's Local and Neighborhood Business District uses, which are less intense than those General Business District uses permitted on the northeast corner of the intersection. It was further explained that yes, if there are specific uses (and neighbors were encouraged to review the list of uses on the City's website and share if there are any uses they'd like to see restricted), then those can be restricted in the PUD Ordinance.]
12. Will a **round-about** work at the intersection with this development? [Response explained that yes, the development and traffic will still function at an acceptable level of service, or greater.]
13. The concept plan shows quite a bit of **landscaping** and green areas. Is the landscaping shown going to be required? Would like to see a nice mix of evergreen trees, deciduous trees and flowers.
14. Are the **elevations** shown required? [Response explained that the final elevations may vary; however, these elevations were incorporated into the PUD Ordinance to set a benchmark for the level of quality required. It was also shared that if any neighbors had any comments or input on the elevations, the development team would be happy to consider those comments.]
15. There was general discussion about the willingness of the development team to work with and incorporate comments from the neighbors. The Walgreens built at **10th and Arlington** in Indianapolis was cited as a successful partnership and cooperative process between neighbors and the developer. The development team offered to put any neighbors in touch with neighbors of that project as a reference. Councilor Spoljaric requested the development team provide the City and neighbors, as an example, with the elevations and ordinance for that development.
16. Was the developer involved with the **intersection study** that was performed in 2008 for this intersection? [Response explained the development team was well aware of the study and believed the proposed development was consistent with the evidence presented in the study; however, encouraged all those interested to read the study from front to back, not to just read the recommendations.]
17. General **concern regarding the development of the intersection** and that it may cause some to put their house up for sale. [Response explained that with any change, which is inevitable, there are responses to those changes. In this case as part of the outreach with the surrounding HOA Boards, the development team learned that although there may be those

that suggest they'll move away because of changes, there have been families that shared they moved into these neighborhoods because of the Kroger center.]

18. **General discussion about the other corners of the intersection.** A comment shared explained that although they believed the southeast corner site was appropriately designed, that this could result in the development of the other corners. [Response explained that development of some sort is likely going to occur because of the conditions that exist at this intersection; however, this proposed development presents an opportunity to create standards that set precedence for the type of development the community will expect to occur at this intersection.]

Noteworthy Topics for Consideration (per above):

- 19. Consideration by development team to restrict specific uses that may currently be permitted in the LB District but requested by neighbors or the City to restrict.
- 20. Consideration by the development team to restrict the hours and nature of dumpster servicing and deliveries to minimize noise during late evening or early morning.
- 21. Consideration by the development team to further restrict lighting (after reviewing the City's applicable lighting restrictions).
- 22. Consideration by the development team to restrict signage facing south (after reviewing the City's applicable signage restrictions).
- 23. Consideration by the development team to incorporate requirements for internal walkway delineations to further emphasize pedestrian-friendly design?